

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-18, 20, and 22 were examined and claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-18, 20, and 22 stand rejected. By virtue of this response, claims 1-4, 11, 14, and 20 have been amended. Amendments are supported by at least the originally filed claims and paragraphs [0024]-[0027] of the published application, for example. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-18, 20, and 22 are presently pending. Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

A. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-14, 16-18, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kao et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0227763, hereinafter “Kao”) in view of Kocher (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,004, hereinafter “Kocher”).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, “the holder comprising: a portion with at least one hole therethrough, wherein the at least one hole is positioned to provide access through the holder to the printed circuit board for testing; and a conductive layer on a surface of the portion with the at least one hole therethrough for positioning adjacent the printed circuitry board.” (Emphasis added.) The amendments are supported by at least the originally filed claims and paragraphs [0024]-[0027] of the application as published, for example; accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Applicants submit that Kao fails to disclose or reasonably suggest the recited features of claim 1. In particular, Kao fails to explicitly or implicitly disclose “a conductive layer on a surface of the portion with the at least one hole therethrough for positioning adjacent the printed circuitry board,” as required by claim 1. Instead, Kao merely describes a “conventional SIM card-seating apparatus” including “a fixture cover 13 [] disposed above the connector 23 to solidly connect the SIM card and connector.” (Paragraph [0006].)

With respect to the recited features of claim 1, the Examiner references FIG.3 of Kao for allegedly illustrating a holder with “eight solder leads or pads [] on the bottom surface (for solder to

the printer circuit board).” (Page 3 of the Office Action.) However, while Kao may implicitly disclose a “conductive layer” on the bottom surface of the eight solder leads or pads, Kao fails to disclose or reasonably suggest “a conductive layer on a surface of the portion with the at least one hole therethrough for positioning adjacent the printed circuitry board,” as required by claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

As such, Applicants submit that Kao at least fails to disclose or reasonably suggest a holder for an electronic module wherein the holder comprises “a conductive layer on a surface of the portion with the at least one hole therethrough for positioning adjacent the printed circuitry board,” as required by claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

Furthermore, the addition of Kocher fails to cure the identified deficiencies of Kao, nor is it alleged to. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the rejection should be withdrawn. In particular, the applied references (i.e., Kao in view of Kocher) fail to at least disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

Additionally, claim 11 has been amended similarly to claim 1 and is allowable for at least similar reasons as stated above. Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 22 and claims 12-14 and 16-18, depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and are allowable for at least depending upon and allowable independent claim. As such, Applicants request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

B. Claims 10 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kao in view of Kocher as applied to Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-14, 16-18, and 22 above, and further in view of Kaneshige et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,917, hereinafter “Kaneshige”).

Applicants submit that claims 10 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and are allowable over Kao and Kocher for at least the reasons stated above. The addition of Kaneshige fails to cure the identified deficiencies of Kao and Kocher, nor is it alleged to. As such, Applicants request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.


CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No.: 03-1952** referencing **Docket No.: 562492006700**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: May 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Denise H. Wong
Registration No.: 59,622

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: 415.268.6221
Fax: 415.268.7522